

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10 are rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 are amended to clarify the present claimed invention. The amendment is supported by Fig. 4 of the original application. No new matter is entered.

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement concurrently with the filing of the present application. The IDS and reference were received by the Patent Office as evidence by the enclosed returned postcard, but the initialed 1449 showing that the reference was considered by the Examiner was never returned.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that a copy of the initialed 1449 be sent to the Applicant showing that the reference was in fact considered and assuring that such references will be printed on the face of the patent document.

A courtesy copy of the IDS, 1449 and reference is enclosed.

In the Office Action claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. It's asserted in the Office Action that claims 1, 5, 9 and 10 are mis-descriptive and has examined the claim with the meaning of "a pattern of selecting predetermined tap factors is changed in accordance with a change in a number of oversamples".

It is respectfully submitted that the limitation in the claims of the present invention does not just provide for the changing of a pattern. Applicant's independent claims recite, as clarified, that a plurality of selectors select a predetermined number of tap factors from a plurality, the selecting is done sequentially in each selector in synchronization with the clock; and one or more of the selectors change the predetermined number of tap factors to be selected and the rest of the selectors change patterns of the selected tap factors, in accordance with a change in the number

of oversamples, which is the number of tap factors to be multiplied by the single input data.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by D'Luna et al. (D'Luna). D'Luna describes an integrated circuit device which selectively functions in real time as either a sequential matrix multiplier, a parallel matrix multiplier, a convolution or a finite input response FIR filter in order to process image data. D'Luna describes the routing unit having coefficients loaded from rows of a matrix. However D'Luna fails to describe features of applicant's claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that D'Luna does not disclose a group of selectors including one or more selectors that change(s) the predetermined number of tap factors to be selected, and the rest of the selectors in the group changing patterns of the selected tap factors, in which the changes are made in accordance with the number of oversamples. X

Because D'Luna does not describe nor suggest the features of applicant's claimed invention the circuit in D'Luna cannot maintain the continuity of the filter output, whereas the present invention can. D'Luna only discloses a common circuit which selectively functions in four operation modes needed in image data processing. This type of circuit cannot maintain the continuity of the filter output. X

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 are different from the cited reference and in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 are dependent on claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 and therefore are likewise in condition for allowance for at least the reason of their dependence and because they each recite additional distinguishing features.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103:


Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over D'Luna. It's admitted in the Office Action that this reference does not disclose changing the tap factors selected by selectors back to predetermined tap factors when the number of oversamples is changed. However, since claims 4 and 8 are dependent on claims 2 and 6 which are dependent on the amended claims 1 and 5. Claims 4 and 8 would not have been obvious since the prior reference does not suggest the feature of a group of selectors including one or more selectors that change(s) the predetermined number of tap factors to be selected, and the rest of the selectors in the group changing patterns of the selected tap factors, in which the changes are made in accordance with the number of oversamples.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman  
Telephone: (212) 940-8703  
Fax: (212) 940-8986  
Docket No.: FUJX 18.514 (100794-11669)  
BSM:fd